

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain in this application. Claims 1-15 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 13-15 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

In response to the submission of an Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 6, 2002, the Office Action states that the reference listed therein was not considered as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.98(a)(2). The applicants note that following a telephone conversation with the Examiner on September 23, 2003, another copy of the previously filed IDS was again filed by facsimile on September 24, 2003. Thus, the requirements noted in the first two paragraphs of the Office Action are believed to have been complied with by applicants. Consideration of the information submitted in the IDS is respectfully solicited, and notice to that effect is requested in a subsequent Office Action.

The abstract is objected to on the basis that it exceeds 150 words. A replacement abstract is provided herein on a separate page. It is submitted that the replacement abstract is in full conformance with 37 CFR 1.72 and MPEP 608.01(b). Therefore, reconsideration of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as a result of informalities stated in the Office Action. The claims are amended to remove or correct the informalities noted in the Office Action. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-15 and their allowance are earnestly requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 08-221187 (JP '187). Applicants herein respectfully traverse these rejections.

For a rejection to be sustained under §102(b) each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the cited prior art reference. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to disclose at least the following features and elements of the present invention as noted herein.

Independent claim 1 recites in pertinent part the following:

head detecting means for detecting at least a
position of the head . . . in at least one linear direction
in a 3D space relative to the screen of the monitor

Rather that detecting a linear position of at least the head of the game player, as claimed in claim 1, JP '187 instead discloses a detection of the rotational angle of

a player's head about a horizontal axis 37 (see Fig. 9) and a vertical axis 41 (see Figs. 4 and 6). According to JP '187, there are two angular position sensors, namely an up-down angular position sensor 32 that detects the rotation of the head about a horizontal axis 37 and a left-right angular position sensor 33 that detects the rotation of the head about a vertical axis 41. Applicants note that the name given to the sensors 32, 33 is somewhat misleading since, while suggesting detection of the head position in a horizontal direction or in a vertical direction, these sensors only detect the rotational positions (angular positions) of the player's head (see end of paragraph [0013]), and not a linear position as claimed.

In addition, JP '187 also fails to provide the following claimed feature of claim 1:

a display control unit for generating a 3D
image viewed from a viewing point of a simulated
camera

Rather, JP '187 discloses a display controller in which an image frame 110 moves in one of "U", "V", "R", and "L" directions (see Fig. 2 of JP '187) in accordance with the detected rotational positions of the head by the rotational position sensors 32, 33. However, as can be seen from Fig. 2 of the cited reference, the image frame 110 is merely scrolled over the larger scenery image (in this case a

road in a town) in any one of U, D, R, and L directions. In other words, the way the viewing frame 110 is scrolled is similar to moving a mask having a square cut-out window over a larger 2D large picture, such that only the cropped image in the square window is visible at any one time while being moved. As such, a viewing point is not actually being altered as the viewing frame is scrolled

On the other hand, according to the present invention, and as exemplified, in particular, in Figs. 4A to 4D, a degree of the exposure of the enemy character AC1 along the vertical direction increases from the state shown in Fig. 4A to the state shown in Fig. 4D via the states shown in Figs. 4B & 4C due to the upward movement of a game player. In particular, a comparison between the top of the wall B in Fig. 4A and Fig. 4D clearly shows a change of a viewing angle as the top part Bs of wall B is clearly visible in Fig. 4D while the same is not visible in Fig. 4A.

Independent claim 15 contains analogous recitations to claim 1, expressed in method terminology. Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and therefore also contains the elements lacking in JP '187, as identified above.

Claims 1, 2 and 15 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 15 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lewis et al. (US 5,177,872). Applicants herein respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites in pertinent part the following:

head detecting means for detecting at least a position of the head of a game player located in a play area before the screen of the monitor in at least one linear direction in a 3D space relative to the screen of the monitor

Thus, claim 1 requires that the head detecting means detects at least the position of the player's head relative to the screen of the monitor in at least one linear direction. In stark contrast, Lewis et al. discloses a virtual reality system 10, which is a wearable type device with a screen 101. While the screen 101 of Lewis et al. shows an image thereon in accordance with the position and direction of the player wearing the wearable device 10, the game players head and the screen remain fixed with respect to one another, and therefore the reference fails to disclose detecting a head position relative to the screen in at least one linear direction.

Independent claim 15 contains an analogous recitation in method terminology. Claims 2 and 6, which depend from claim 1 also contain this element lacking in Lewis et al..

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as obvious over JP 08-221187 (JP '187) in view of Ball (US 5,686,942) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Ball reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, from which the claims depend, that is absent from the primary JP '187 reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 6 and 7 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 10-14 are rejected as obvious over JP 08-221187 (JP '187) in view of Oh (US 5,616,078) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Oh reference does

not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, from which the rejected claims depend, that is absent from the primary JP '187 reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 4 and 10-14 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected as obvious over Lewis et al., and further in view of Ahdoot (US 5,913,727) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Ball reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, from which the claims depend, that is absent from the primary Lewis et al. reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 3 and 4 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 7-14 are rejected as obvious over Lewis et al. in view of Ahdoot (US 5,913,727), and further in view of Oh under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Oh fails to provide what is missing from both Lewis et al. and Ahdoot, as discussed above, and therefore, the proffered combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 5 and 7-14 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

Sammy & The Q
Reg No. 36,049